



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,823	09/30/2003	Joerg Meyer	Q76760	2199
23373 7590 12/24/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER HAN, QI	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/24/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,823

Applicant(s)

MEYER, JOERG

Examiner

QI HAN

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2008 and 24 September 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

2. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment dated 09/24/2008 and 08/25/2008. The applicant(s) filed a substitute specification and amended claims 1-2, 8, 16, and added new claims 20-25 (see the amendment: pages 2-8).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 09/24/2008 and 08/25/2008 with respect to the claim rejection under 35 USC 103, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, since the amended independent claims and newly added claims introduce new issue and/or change the scope of the claims, which necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection (see detail below).

It is noted that the response to the applicant's arguments regarding the old issue(s) (such as imputing function and parameters separately) of the previously presented claims is directed to the advisory office action filed on 02/04/2008, because the applicant substantially repeated the same arguments. Further, the response to the applicant's arguments based on the newly amended claims (see Remarks: pages 12-14) is directed to the corresponding prior art claim rejection with the corresponding new ground (see below).

It is also noted that the previous cited references are still applicable to the prior art rejection (may include newly combined teachings and/or interpretations) for the newly amended and added claims with new issue(s)/ground(s) (see detailed rejection below).

4. In addition, in response to applicant's argument regarding claims 1, 2 and 8 that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "creating analogy programs such as ladder diagram", emphasized by applicant in Remarks: pages 10) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5. Furthermore, regarding the arguments (Remark: pages 15-17) of the rejection for claims 17 and 18, by reviewing the MPEP and claimed language, it is believed that the claimed limitations "for creating or editing a portion of an electric analog circuit diagram" and "for creating or editing a ladder diagram" are broadly interpreted as intended use the invention, in light of specification. It is noted that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (see MPEP 2106. II.C). It is noted that, as stated in the rejection, DORI discloses 'modeling system' for variety of applications, comprising 'the received input' and 'the textual description' generated 'as a real-time response to user input manipulating, adding, or deleting (editing) graphic elements (include

diagram)', 'using generated text to automatically generate software instructions (program) to implement the model or to provide a visual simulation of a modeled system', 'to receive a textural description of a model...generate (create) a model diagram' (col. 1, line 5 to col. 2, line 40), and that 'user can enter text into the script window by typing, using speech recognition...' (col. 3, lines 28-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that textural instruction (command) recognized from speech command would be executed/operated in the same way as typed textural instruction does for whatever an application is required, and to modify KIST in view of MORGAN by providing instruction (command) for generating (create) related diagram(s) or editing graphic elements for variety of applications, as taught by DORI, for the purpose (motivation) of generating textual description of a graphic model and/or offering the techniques of generating graphic model (including diagram) in a wide variety of applications (DORI: abstract), wherein the applications would include the claimed functionality because in light of the disclosure of the specification, the claimed feature is nothing more than generating textual instruction(s) in the same way as typing textual instruction(s) for whatever the corresponding application is required. It also noted that the 'graphic elements', 'a visual simulation of a modeled system' and 'model diagram' created by DORI (see OPM diagram in drawings) are all capable of presenting (or inherently include) claimed "a portion of electric analog circuit diagram" or "diagram ladder". Finally, it is reminded that, for helping applicant's future amendment or consideration, the "diagram ladder" may refer to (or interpreted as) message sequence chart, in Unified Modeling language (UML), which is disclosed by DORI (loc. 1, lines 21-35 and/or OPM diagrams in the drawings) and further supports the examiner's rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 20, the limitation of “the operations of ... are **repeated** creating an executable program in a non-graphical programming language of automation systems” introduces new subject matter, because it is not specifically described in the original specification. It also noted that the applicant failed to provide reference(s) in the original specification to show where the limitation(s) came from.

Regarding claims 23 and 25, the limitation of “wherein the format for the parameters comprises number and type of parameters and additional items that are verbally input and link one parameter to another” introduces new subject matter, because it is not specifically described in the original specification. It also noted that the applicant failed to provide reference(s) in the original specification to show where the limitation(s) came from.

Regarding claims 21-22, the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 20 and 23, because the dependent claims includes the same problematic limitations as their parent claims respectively.

In addition, regarding claim 21, the limitation of “sequentially selecting components from a library of components” introduces new subject matter, because it is not specifically described

in the original specification. It also noted that the applicant failed to provide reference(s) in the specification to show where the limitation(s) came from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. Claims 1-2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KIST et al. (US 6871179 B1) hereinafter referenced as KIST in view of MORGAN et al. (US 6937984 B1) hereinafter referenced as MORGAN.

As per **claim 1**, KIST discloses ‘method and apparatus for executing voice commands having dictation as a parameter’ (title), comprising:

“entering the function of the instruction as a verbal input via the voice recognition system” (col. 2, lines 56-63, ‘receiving (entering) a user input corresponding to the spoken utterance (verbal input)’, ‘this input is processed to identify a pattern of word formatting the spoken utterance which matches a predetermined command pattern (function)’);

Even though KIST discloses that his system/method includes ‘user input by ...keyboard (i.e. manual input), KIST does not expressly disclose “**acknowledging** the verbal input of the function of the instruction via the manual input”. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by MORGAN who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses ‘speech command input recognition system for interactive computer display with speech controlled display of recognized commands’ (title), teaching that ‘most current voice (speech) recognition systems provide some form of visual feedback which permits the user to confirm (acknowledge) that the computer understands his speech utterances’ and ‘at some stage, the **interactive user** is required to make some **manual input**’ (col. 2, lines 21-32); providing ‘visual feedback’ in a ‘voice

recognition system' for 'confirming the recognition of command' (col. 2, lines 40-46); 'a user is capable of inputting **visual information** to the system through the **keyboard** or mouse (manual input) **in addition to speech input**' (col. 4, lines 22-23); and 'the visual feedback of displayed commands' (col. 4, lines 47-64), which suggests that the system has capability of interactively using spoken and/or manual input for entering command (function) and the corresponding parameter(s) as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KIST by providing some manual input, such as confirmation or acknowledgement, at some stage of user interaction with recognized speech system, as taught by MORGAN, so as to interactively use spoken and/or manual input for entering command (function) and/or the corresponding parameter(s), for the purpose (motivation) of handling possible recognition errors and/or confirming the accuracy of spoken commands (MORGAN: col. 2, lines 17-18 and 40-41).

KIST in view of MORGAN further discloses:

"after the acknowledging of the entered function of the instruction, correlating the entered function of the instruction with a stored set of instructions" (KIST: col. 2, lines 56-67 and col. 3, lines 13-17, 'identify (correlate) a pattern (entered function of the instruction) of in the spoken utterance to match any one of a plurality of the pre-determined command patterns (a stored set of instructions)');

"determining format for the parameters of the entered instructions based on the correlating" (KIST: col. 2, lines 56-67, 'the one or more parameters are extracted (determined) form word contained in a dictation portion of the voice command');and

“after the acknowledging, entering the parameters of the instruction as a further verbal input via the voice recognition system” (KIST col. 2, lines 65-68, ‘the one or more parameters are extracted from words contained in a dictation portion of the voice command which are distinct from the pattern of words matching the command pattern’; col. 6, lines 58-65),

“wherein the determining of the format for the parameters is prior to the parameters being entered as the further verbal input” (KIST: col. 3, lines 29-40 ‘identifying (determining) a pattern of words forming the spoken utterance which matches a pre-determined command pattern as well as a computer system command that corresponds to the pre-determined command pattern and has at least one parameter...’; MORGAN: col. 2, lines 21-32, ‘at some stage, the interactive user is required to make some manual input (implying system waiting for further user input)’; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that identifying a spoken command by matching a pre-determined command pattern would have to determine (by matching the pattern as stated above) whether or not the command has parameter(s) first and then to determine what next/further process(s) would be (i.e. determining the format prior to processing (such as entering or inputting) the one or more parameters), and to combine the teachings of identifying spoken command by matching the spoken utterance and a pre-determined command pattern with parameter(s) disclosed by KIST and the teachings of using some manual input (such as confirmation or acknowledgement) at some stage of user interaction(s) during speech recognition as taught by MORGAN, so as to provide interactive user spoken and/or manual input (including confirming/acknowledging) for entering command (function) and/or entering the corresponding parameter(s), for the purpose (motivation) of handling possible recognition errors and/or confirming the accuracy of spoken

Art Unit: 2626

commands (MORGAN: col. 2, lines 17-18 and 40-41), wherein the ordinary skilled artisan in the art would have recognized that the manual input (such as confirming/acknowledging) for the parameter(s) would be the same way as for the command at some stage because this implementations and its variations (such as entering a command with zero, one or more parameters) would be within the scope of capability of the artisan in the art and the result would be predictable).

In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would have also recognized that the combined system could readily implement inputting instructions by automatic speech recognition, mutual input, and/or combination of the two, as claimed, because the combined references disclose inputting instructions with parameters by both speech recognition and manual input/confirmation (such as by using keyboard), and the result of the different input methods would be predictable.

As per **claim 2** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because it also reads on the limitations of claim 2.

As per **claim 8**, it recites computer system. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1, except the limitation “a computer; a display screen connected to the computer to display information, a microphone connected to the computer, and a manual input provided at least in a vicinity of the display screen and connected to the computer”. However, these features are further disclosed by KIST (Fig. 1, blocks 10, 26, 22, 18 and 20).

8. Claims 3-5, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KIST in view of MORGAN as applied to claim 1, and further in view of CHAVES (US 6510414 B1).

As per **claim 3** (depending on claim 2), even though KIST in view of MORGAN discloses that 'the parameter' from 'the spoken utterances' is 'separate from the pattern of words matching the command pattern' (KIST: abstract), and providing 'manual input' for confirming (acknowledging) (MORGAN: see claim 1), KIST in view of MORGAN does not expressly disclose "separate function and parameter keys... to acknowledge the verbal input... respectively". However, the feature of a function key associated with certain data entry is well known in the art as evidenced by CHAVES who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses 'speech recognition assisted data entry system and method' (title), teaching that 'speech recognition system may highlight the (recognizable) characters corresponding to a specific data entry field', 'a function key may be associated with a particular data entry field of data entry application' in a speech recognition system (col. 5, lines 51-56); and providing activating/deactivating speech recognition and providing functionality of 'edit characters input into data entry application (manual input)' (Fig. 3, locks 124-130). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that additional function key(s) is/are available on a computer keyboard for entering different input information and/or triggering some event (such as inputting data and/or activating/deactivating mode), and to modify KIST in view of MORGAN by providing a function key associated with a particular data entry field, as taught by CHAVES, for the purpose (motivation) of increasing accuracy and

flexibility for a speech recognition assisted data entry system (CHAVES: col. 1, lines 67 to col. 2, line 4).

In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that **typing** a textual instruction (or command) would require to enter “space” key or “enter” key for separating a command (function) and its parameters, and when **speaking** the same instruction, the speech recognition mechanism would automatically and inherently recognize the separations between spoken command word(s) and its parameter words too, for performing normal operation.

As per **claim 4** (depending on claim 3), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 3, because the rejection for claim 3 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4, wherein it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that additional function key(s) is/are available on computer keyboard and used for entering different information, as state above, including acknowledging multiple parameters.

As per **claim 5** (depending on claim 3), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 3, because the rejection for claim 3 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 3, wherein it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that a specific key (parameter key), such as “space” key, “enter” key or different function keys can be used multiple times or separately for different parameters.

As per **claim 16** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason used for claim 5, because it also reads on the limitation(s) of claim 16.

As per **claim 19** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason used for claims 3 and 5, because the rejection of claims 3 and 5 includes the same or similar limitations as claim 19. In addition, ‘executing a voice command in the form of a spoken utterance having a dictation portion’ and/or ‘perform an event in accordance with the one or more parameters’ disclosed by KIST (col. 3, lines 25-40) is broadly read on the claimed “executing the entered function of the instructions along with the entered parameters.”

9. Claims 6-7, 9-11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KIST in view of MORGAN as applied to claims 1 and 8, and further in view of L’ESPERANCE (US 2002/0055844 A1) hereinafter referenced as L’ESPERANCE.

As per **claim 6** (depending on claim 1), KIST in view of MORGAN does not expressly disclose “an operator screen is provided that overlays keys for the manual input utilizing a software program”. However, the feature of a function key associated with a particular data entry field is well known in the art as evidenced by L’ESPERANCE who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses ‘speech user interface for portable personal devices’ (title), comprising ‘PDA (personal digital assistant)’ including ‘automatic speech recognition module to provide dynamic response and feedback to the user’s commands’ and ‘support visual display of any spoken information’ (paragraph (hereinafter referenced as p)14); providing ‘touch screen’ (p55-59); ‘interface display (operator screen)’ including options of ‘speech preferences menu’, ‘entries may be done with a virtual keyboard using a stylus’ (p67); which necessarily and/or inherently includes overlaying keys and using software program as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KIST in

view of MORGAN by providing touch screen including virtual keyboard (including overlaying keys) for entering information, as taught by L'ESPERANCE, for the purpose (motivation) of supporting visual display of any spoken information (L'ESPERANCE: p14).

As per **claim 7** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 6, because the rejection for claim 6 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 7, wherein combined teachings with 'the visual feedback of displayed commands' (MORGAN: col. 4, lines 47-64) can be read on the claim.

As per **claim 9** (depending on claim 8), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 6, because the rejection for claim 6 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 9, wherein 'microphone module' in the PDA disclosed by L'ESPERANCE (Figs. 1-2) can be read on the claim.

As per **claim 10** (depending on claim 8), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 6, because the rejection for claim 6 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 9, wherein 'virtual keyboard using a stylus' on 'the user interface display' disclosed by L'ESPERANCE (p67) is read on the claimed "pressure sensitive foil applied to the display screen".

As per **claim 11** (depending on claim 8), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 6, because the rejection for claim 6 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 9, wherein 'PDA' disclosed by L'ESPERANCE can be read on the claimed "a manually operable mobile input unit".

As per **claim 15** (depending on claim 11), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 9, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 9.

10. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KIST in view of MORGAN and L'ESPERANCE as applied to claim 11, and further in view of WOODWARD (US 2002/0123893 A1).

As per **claim 12** (depending on claim 11), KIST in view of MORGAN and L'ESPERANCE does not expressly disclose “the mobile input unit is coupled with the computer via a cable”. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by WOODWARD who, in the same field of endeavor, discloses ‘processing speech recognition errors in an embedded speech recognition system’ (title), comprising ‘the embedded speech recognition system (PDA or palm computer—corresponding to the mobile input unit) and the remote training system (corresponding to the computer) through communication link’ including ‘wireless or wireline technologies...such as infrared...Bluetooth,...direct cable’ (Fig. 1 and p20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify KIST in view of MORGAN and L'ESPERANCE by providing communication to a computer system through wireless or wireline, such as infrared or cable, as taught by WOODWARD, for the purpose (motivation) of processing and correcting speech misrecognitions by using suitable communications system (WOODWARD: abstract and p20).

As per **claim 13** (depending on claim 11), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 12, because the rejection for claim 12 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 13.

As per **claim 14** (depending on claim 13), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 12, because the rejection for claim 12 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 14.

11. Claims 17-18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over KIST in view of MORGAN as applied to claim 1, and further in view of DORI (US 7,099,809 B2).

As per **claim 17** (depending on claim 1), even though KIST in view of MORGAN discloses that "the function of the instruction is a command" (see above), KIST in view of MORGAN does not expressly disclose the command "for creating or editing a portion of an electric analog circuit diagram". However, the similar feature is well known in the art as evidenced by DORI who discloses 'modeling system' (title) for variety of applications (abstract), comprising 'the received input' and 'the textual description' generated 'as a real-time response to user input manipulating, adding, or deleting (editing) graphic elements (include diagram)', 'using generated text to automatically generate software instructions (program) to implement the model or to provide a visual simulation of a modeled system', 'to receive a textual description of a model...generate (create) a model diagram' (col. 1, line 5 to col. 2, line 40), and that 'user can enter text into the script window by typing, using speech recognition...' (col. 3, lines 28-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that textual instruction (command) recognized from speech command would be executed/operated in the same way as typed textual instruction does for whatever an application is required, and to modify KIST in view of MORGAN by providing instruction

(command) for generating (create) related diagram(s) or editing graphic elements for variety of applications, as taught by DORI, for the purpose (motivation) of generating textual description of a graphic model and/or offering the techniques of generating graphic model (including diagram) in a wide variety of applications (DORI: abstract), wherein the applications would include the claimed functionality because in light of the disclosure of the specification, the claimed feature is nothing more than generating textual instruction(s) in the same way as typing textual instruction(s) for whatever the corresponding application is required.

As per **claim 18** (depending on claim 1), the rejection is based on the same reason used for claim 17, because it also reads on the limitation(s) of claim 18.

As per **claim 20** (depending on claim 1), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112.1st (see above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 17, because it also reads on the limitation(s) of claim 20, wherein ‘automatically generate software **instructions**’ and ‘enter text into the script window by typing, using speech recognition’ (DORI: col. 1, line2-6 and col. 3, lines 28-29) suggest that the operations would be repeated.

As per **claim 21** (depending on claim 20), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112.1st (see above), KIST in view of MORGAN and DORI further disclose:

“sequentially selecting components from a library of components” (KIST: col. 1, line 36-37 and Fig. 2, ‘vocabulary database’ and blocks 44,46 and 48 corresponds to library of components for the search including selecting) ;

“displaying the selected components on a display using graphical symbols (visual information, icon) that represent the selected components” (MORGAN: Figs 3-5; or DORI: Fig. 30-35); and

“linking the selected components via the operations of entering the function, acknowledging the verbal input, correlating the entered function, determining the format, and entering the parameters” (as stated in claim 1, wherein identifying and matching process would necessarily or inherently include the linking as claimed; also see DORI: Fig. 30-35).

As per **claim 22** (depending on claim 21), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 17 and 21, because it also reads on the limitation(s) of claim 22, wherein disclosed feature of ‘manipulating, adding, or deleting (editing) graphic elements’ by DORI (col. 1, lines 58-60) is read on the claimed renaming feature.

As per **claim 23** (depending on claim 1), as best understood in view of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112.1st (see above), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 1 and 17, because it also reads on the limitation(s) of claim 23, wherein combined teachings including disclosure regarding ‘the generated text to automatically generate software instructions to implement the model or to provide a visual simulation of a modeled system’ and ‘enter text into the script window by typing, using speech recognition’ (DORI: col. 2, lines 3-13, col. 3, lines 28-29, Figs. 25, 30-35 and 39) are read on the claimed “wherein the format for the parameters comprises number and type of parameters and additional items that are verbally input and link one parameter to another.” It is also noted that MORGAN disclose using OS/2, window 95 (including Dos commands), Window NT and UNIX operating systems that inherently include

parameter with number(s) and/or type of parameters and provide command format (pattern or template) information including both command(s) and the corresponding parameters.

As per **claim 24** (depending on claim 23), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 23, because it also reads on the limitation(s) of claim 24.

As per **claim 25** (depending on claim 8), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 23, because the claim recites the same or similar limitations as claim 23.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop ____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to QI HAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH:9:00-19:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richmond Dorvil can be reached on (571)-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

QH/qh
December 22, 2008
/Qi Han/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626